



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/777,959	02/07/2001	Dahong Qian	202938US67 5801			
22850 7	590 10/04/2004		EXAMINER			
	VAK, MCCLELLAND,	PATEL, HARESH N				
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2154	<u> </u>		
				DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<del></del>		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/777,95	09/777,959 QIAN ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit			
	•	Haresh P	atel	2154			
Dariad 6	The MAILING DATE of this commu	nication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any earn	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN ensions of time may be available under the provision of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this cone period for reply specified above is less than thirty of period for reply is specified above, the maximum cure to reply within the set or extended period for repl reply received by the Office later than three months leed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NICATION.  as of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no even munication.  (30) days, a reply within the statustatutory period will apply and will by statutory by statute, cause the apply	ent, however, may a reply be tim story minimum of thirty (30) days Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from i ication to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C.§ 133).			
Status	·						
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 July 2004</u> .						
2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)[_]	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)	<ul> <li>✓ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 12,13,23 and 24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>☑ Claim(s) 1-11 and 14-22 is/are rejected.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on <u>09 July 200</u> . Applicant may not request that any objected Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the oath or declaration is objected.	$4 \text{ is/are: } a) \square \text{ accepted}$ ection to the drawing(s) but the correction is required.	e held in abeyance. See ed if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priorit  2. Certified copies of the priorit  3. Copies of the certified copies application from the Internat See the attached detailed Office acti	y documents have bee y documents have bee s of the priority docume ional Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Application ents have been receive e 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmer	nt(s)		,				
1) Notice	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) @		4) Interview Summary				
3) 🛛 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or No(s)/Mail Date 6/22/2001.		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2154

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-24 are presented for examination. Claims 12, 13, 23 and 24 are restricted.

## Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-11 and 14-22, in the reply filed on 7/9/2004, is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that even though the Group I invention and Group II (claims 12, 13, 23, 24) invention are distinct inventions, the claims of Group I and Group II appear to be part of overlapping search area and would not place a serious burden on the examiner. This is not found persuasive because the search for Group I invention is necessary in subclass 227 and relative subclasses 223 to 226 of class 709. The search for Group II invention is necessary in subclass 203 and relative subclass 202. Hence, both the inventions are not part of overlapping search area. Since, a separate search is necessary for Group I invention and Group II invention, it is indeed a serious burden on the examiner.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

3. Examiner examines applicant elected Group I, i.e., claims 1-11 and 14-22.

## **Priority**

4. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.

# Specification

5. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The present title is not sufficient for proper classification of the claimed subject matter.

Art Unit: 2154

The following title is suggested: "Multiple client users to interact with secure web page together over the Internet".

# Information Disclosure Statement

6. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Paper dated, 6/22/2001, is attached to the instant Office action.

## Claim Objections

7. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 mentions that "and to second create", which should be "and second to create".

Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 8. Claims 1, 9, 14, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 9. Claims 1 and 14 recites the limitations, "one client of the group", "to prevent the web site", "the same temporary identifier", "the same web page", "all the clients in the group". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Also, it is not clear which client is referred for display.

Art Unit: 2154

10. Claims 9 and 20, recite the limitations, "the identity", "the same web page", "the group". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Also, it is not clear which group is referred by each member.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 12. Claims 1-6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Quatrano et al., Cisco Technology Inc., 6,748,420 (Hereinafter Quatrano-Cisco).
- 13. As per claims 1, 9, 14 and 20, Quatrano-Cisco teaches a method and a group-browsing system as follows:

a plurality of clients (e.g., figure 1) each including a shared web browser (e.g., figure 6); a server (e.g., figure 6) linked to the shared web browser of each client and configured to monitor the transmission of a web site URL request from the shared web browser of one client of the group and to direct that request to the shared web browser of other clients in the group (e.g., col., 23, line 61 – col., 24, line 17, figure 5); and

Art Unit: 2154

a gatekeeper module configured to first mask the identity of each client computer (e.g., figure 6, col., 6, lines 1-24) to prevent the web site from retrieving any client's actual identifier and (e.g., col., 25, line 46 – col., 26, line 21) to second create the same temporary identifier for each client when any client logs on to the web site so that the same web page is displayed for all the clients in the group (e.g., col., 25, line 46 – col., 26, line 21).

- 14. As per claims 2, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:the group-browsing system is a scalable secure system (e.g., col., 30, lines 1-21, figure 8).
- 15. As per claims 3, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:

  the gatekeeper module resides on each client (e.g., multiple adapters that can reside on eseparate systems, col., 30, lines 8 21).
- 16. As per claims 4, 10, 15 and 21, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:the identifier is a cookie and the temporary identifier is a temporary cookie (e.g., col., 25, line 46 col., 26, line 21, figure 6).
- 17. As per claims 5, 11, 16 and 22, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:

the gatekeeper further including means for deleting the temporary identifier at the end of a group-browsing session to prevent any client from returning to the web site identified as another client (e.g., col., 29, lines 26-64).

Art Unit: 2154

18. As per claims 6 and 17, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:

the gatekeeper further including means for generating a warning message when any client logs on to the web site to inform that client that the other clients in the group will now be able to access that clients private information (e.g., col., 28, line 47 - col., 29, line 11).

19. As per claims 8 and 19, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the following:

client software configured to detect the end of a group-browsing session and, in response, to direct a client's secure browser to transmit the web site URL to allow the client to return to the previously accessed web site (e.g., col., 29, lines 40 - 64).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 21. Claims 7 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quatrano-Cisco in view of "Official Notice".
- 22. As per claims 7 and 18, Quatrano-Cisco teaches the claimed limitations rejected under claims 1 and 14. However, Quatrano-Cisco does not specifically mention about tracking the actions of all clients for billing purposes. "Official Notice" is taken that both the concept and advantages of providing tracking the actions of all clients for billing purposes is well known and expected in the art.

Art Unit: 2154

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include tracking the actions of all clients for billing purposes with the teachings of Quatrano-Cisco in order to facilitate charging clients for the usage of the website information. The well-known concept of monitoring the action of all clients utilizing the web information usage would help bill the clients according the web content usage and based on the duration of the web information usage.

## Conclusion

- 23. Examiner makes a very clear note that the rational of the applicant's invention has been clearly taught by Quatrano-Cisco. Applicant's invention does contain few minor additional matters that facilitate the concepts of the applicant's invention. However, the additional minor matters are well known in the art.
- 24. Examiner has found numerous arts related to the disclosed subject matter. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is 703-605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Haresh Patel

September 28, 2004

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100